(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Clauses 32 to 62 both inclusive and schedules 1, 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass

Sri Kadidal Manjappa.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Rent Control Bill, 1960, as passed by the Legislative Council be passed."

Mr. Deputy Speaker.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Rent Control Bill, 1960, as passed by the Legislative Council be passed."

The motion was adopted.

INDIAN PARTNERSHIP (MYSORE AMENDMENT) BILL 1960.—

Motion to consider

Sri B. Vaikunta Baliga (Minister for Law and Labour).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Indian Partnership (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1960, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Deputy Speaker.— Motion moved:

"That the Indian Partnership (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1960, be taken into consideration."

Sri B. Vaikunta Baliga.— Sir, the point covered by the Bill is very simple and it cannot be open to debate. The Central Act that is Act IX of 1932 relates to the Indian Partnership Act. When States Reorganisation Act wa passed, by section 120 of the S. R. Act, this Government adopted the Indian Partnership Act of 1932 and the Act was suitably amended by passing section 59A. At that time, one little idea was overlooked namely that the district of Bellary had not come into the Reorganisation and had become part of the Mysore State a little earlier. Now so far as Bellary area is concerned it is necessary to amend it because the Registrar of Partnerships in Mysore has not got power to amend and the Madras Govt. has passed an Act removing the powers of the Registrar there and making his powers inoperative so far as Bellary is concerned. Therefore it is inevitable that the Registrar of Mysore should be vested with the power;and it is to fulfil that object this very simple Bill has been brought up. The object of the Bill is very simple and innocuous and in the interest of justice and equity that partnership concerns of Bellary desire that this should be passed.

Therefore I commend it to the acceptance of the House.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, I always like to agree with my hon'ble friend the Minister for Law. He has a seductive intelligence which we cannot resist.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Not adequate enough to persuade you.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—It may be so innocuous that we are forced to admit. But I would like to ask: when did the Government find out that the Bellary District was not includ d in the previous legislation ? I am sure we have gone on all these months without this provision being there. This delay is criminal. The States Reorganisation took place in 1956 and this Bill is published in 1960. Four years hence,.... the Hon'ble Minister has become Law Minister twice in that interval of four years. The G vernment have slept over the matter and only when the names of these partners were deleted from the Register in Madras—possibly very recently, this Government woke up.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—The Opposition also.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—You are not competent to make a statement like that and charge the Opposition for the misdeeds of the Government. What have the Opposition to do with it? The Opposition have said a number of times that the Government have committed gross negligence in this matter. Did the Opposition know the names of the partners registered in Madras? Did we have all this information before us to say that you have omitted Bellary? It merely shows bankruptcy of states manship on your part. I am supporting this Bill. I am not so muddle-headed to say that I oppose this Bill. I am only saying that it is already four years and have come before the Legislature now with a Bill of this type to repair the omission. I only say that more vigilence is necessary in all these things. I do not know who is responsible for this. These things should not be repeated too often in this Assembly.

†Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I am grateful to the Hon'ble Member for the very valuable support he has given to the basic idea contained in the Act, but I am sorry I am unable to agree with him that there is so much as to attract criticism of the volume that was made. I have heard all that the Hon'ble Member said. I would like to tell him that the previous amendment was a consequential amendment on account of integration and nothing else and it did not have any other object. My friend will agree with me that all of us put together we will not be able to bring about uniformity in a very large number of legislations that we have in the State. This is not the only one, but there are very many legislations to be seen. Therefore, the workload that has to be appreciated has rendered it almost impossible to amend everything and do all that is needed within the time. I am grateful to the Hon'ble Members for this support to this Bill. I hope the House will now accept the Bill unanimously.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Indian Partnership (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1960, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question :

"That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I move :

"That the Indian Partnership (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1960, be passed."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Indian Partnership (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1960, be passe"

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE HIGH COURT BILL. 1959.

Motion to resume consideration

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Law and Labour).—I beg to move under the proviso to sub-rule (3) of rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure that the Mysore High Court Bill, 1959 introduced in the Legislative Assembly on 23rd December 1959, be permitted to be continued.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore High Court Bill, 1959, introduced in the Legislative Assembly on 23rd December 1959, be permitted to be continued."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet on Monday at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Thirty Minutes Past Twelve of the Clock, to meet again at One of the Clock on Monday the 24th July, 1961.

WD 6599—GPB—500—(L.A. New)—4-3-67